



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE                           | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/963,335   | 09/24/2001                            | Kenneth A. Klarfeld  | MET1.0023           | 2141             |  |
| 23386<br>MYERS DAV                                       | 7590 12/18/2006<br>WES ANDRAS & SHERM | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |  |
| 19900 MACARTHUR BLVD.,<br>SUITE 1150<br>IRVINE, CA 92612 |                                       |                      | BROWN, RUEBEN M     |                  |  |
|  |                                       |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| ,  |                                       |                      | 2623                |                  |  |
|  |                                       |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |                                       |                      | <u> </u>            | DELIVER I MODE   |  |
|  |                                       |                      | 12/18/2006          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 09/963,335      | KLARFELD ET AL. |              |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |              |  |  |
| Reuben M. Brown | 2623            |              |  |  |

|  | Reuben W. Brown   | 2023  |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence add  | ress                                      |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS   | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F  | OR ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:   | the same day as filing a Notice of<br>ving replies: (1) an amendment, af-<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in            | Appeal. To avoid aba<br>fidavit, or other eviden<br>compliance with 37 Cl | rce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)            |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth   |   |   |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70  | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | E FIRST REPLY WAS F   | ILED WITHIN                               |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri  | ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | o avoid dismissal of the  |   |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u>  |   |   |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.   | nsideration and/or search (see NO   |   | ecause                                    |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  |   | ducing or simplifying t   | he issues for                             |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c   | corresponding number of finally rej   | ected claims.   |   |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   | NA O HOLDINGS SENSO   |   | DTOL 004)                                 |
| <ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>  |   | ompliant Amendment (  | PTOL-324).                                |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable if submitted in a separate,   | timely filed amendme  | nt canceling the                          |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   | II be entered and an e  | explanation of                            |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |   |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   | •   |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>20-31</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |   |   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |   | ,   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |   |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome all rejections under appe   | al and/or appellant fai   | ls to provide a                           |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after e   | ntry is below or attach   | ed.                                       |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Attached, Advisory Action.</li> </ol>   | t does NOT place the application i  | n condition for allowar   | nce because:                              |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. ☐ Other:  | 1 2   | Ville   |   |
|  | CHRI  | S KELLEY DATENT EYAMINER  |   |
|  | SUPERVISORY   | PATENT EXAMINER   |   |

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600** 

Application/Control Number: 09/963,335

Art Unit: 2623

## **ADVISORY ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues on page 7-12, that Herz does not teach the claimed feature of, 'presenting the viewer with a list of the selected programs, the list arranged in accordance with the viewer characteristics information profile', as presently found in claim 28 and substantially found in proposed amendment to claim 20. Applicant provides an example of this feature on page 7, by discussing a 'viewer that has several profiles designated for example sports, game shows, news, etc., ... The viewer would be left with a vast selection of sports shows focusing on sports programs presented to him for viewing... In accordance with the present invention, the list of TV programs selected for presentation to the viewer would be further arranged in accordance with the viewer characteristics information profile. For example, the profile may show a predominate interest in football, followed by a secondary interest in basketball and baseball in that order... the list of TV programs would be arranged with all football programs at the top of the listing followed by all basketball programs and then all baseball programs. The list may be further arranged to favor live broadcast over replays and talk shows'.

Examiner points out that despite the example provided applicant, the claimed feature is broader than this example. The feature of, 'the list arranged in accordance with the viewer characteristics information profile', is broad enough to read on any factor (with respect to the

Application/Control Number: 09/963,335

Art Unit: 2623

viewer profile) used to present the list of recommended programs to the subscriber in Herz. It is noted that that the claimed 'arranged' does not recite any particular format, such as by order, genre, category, etc. Thus, by definition Herz reads on the broad language, for instance at col. 29, lines 30-40, "in which all of the video programming available at the head end is scheduled on "customized" channels in accordance with the customer profiles of customers and in which a subset of the programming on the "customized" channels available to each customer is selected using an agreement matrix for presentation to the customer as "virtual channels" tailored to that customer's characteristic profiles", emphasis added.

Furthermore, Herz teaches that "Once the agreement matrix has been generated, those programs with the highest values for ac, i.e., the closest distance (1/ac) and hence closet match to the customer's profile or profiles, are prioritized and selected for presentation as "virtual channels", col. 25, lines 18-30. This discussion reads on the broad language of, 'arranged in accordance with the viewer characteristics information profile'. Finally, the teaching of Herz of, "or else the recommended programming is highlighted in an obvious manner", (col. 45, lines 39-45) also reads on the subject matter, which delineates the recommended programs from those that are not recommended.

In view of the above discussion, examiner maintains the rejection record, mailed 8/10/06.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/963,335

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

CHRIS KELLEY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600